

Time Step Size Limitation Introduced by the BSSN Gamma Driver

Erik Schnetter

*Center for Computation & Technology, Louisiana State University, USA and
Department of Physics & Astronomy, Louisiana State University, USA**

(Dated: March 3, 2010)

Many mesh refinement simulations currently performed in numerical relativity counteract instabilities near the outer boundary of the simulation domain either by changes to the mesh refinement scheme or by changes to the gauge condition. We point out that the BSSN *Gamma Driver* gauge condition introduces a time step size limitation in a similar manner as a CFL condition, but which is independent of the spatial resolution. We give a didactic explanation of this issue, show why especially mesh refinement simulations suffer from it, and point to a simple remedy.

I. INTRODUCTION

We assume that the audience is familiar with the concept of a Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition [1]. Loosely speaking, the CFL condition states: When a partial differential equation, for example the wave equation

$$\partial_t^2 u = c^2 \Delta u \quad , \quad (1)$$

is integrated numerically, then the time step size δt is limited by the spatial resolution δx and the maximum propagation speed c by

$$\delta t < Q \frac{\delta x}{c} \quad . \quad (2)$$

Here Q is a constant of order 1 that depends on the time integration method (and details of the spatial discretisation). Choosing a time step size larger than this is unstable and must therefore be avoided. (There are time integration methods that do not have such a stability limit, but these are expensive and not commonly used in numerical relativity, so we will ignore them here.)

II. EXAMPLE: EXPONENTIAL DECAY

In real-world equations, there are also other restrictions which limit the time step size, and which may be independent of the spatial resolution. One simple example for this is the exponential decay

$$\partial_t u = -\lambda u \quad (3)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the decay constant. Note that this equation is an ordinary differential equation, as there are no spatial derivatives. The solutions of (3) are given by

$$u(t) = A \exp\{-\lambda t\} \quad (4)$$

with amplitude A .

The decay constant λ has dimension $1/T$. The time step size is limited by

$$\delta t < Q' \frac{1}{\lambda} \quad (5)$$

where Q' is a constant of order 1 that depends on the time integration method. Choosing a time step size larger than this is unstable and must therefore be avoided. (As with the CFL criterion, there are time integration methods that do not have such a stability limit.)

As an example, let us consider the forward Euler scheme with a step size δt . This leads to the discrete time evolution equation

$$\frac{u^{n+1} - u^n}{\delta t} = -\lambda u^n \quad (6)$$

or

$$u^{n+1} = (1 - \delta t \lambda) u^n \quad . \quad (7)$$

This system is unstable e.g. if $|u^{n+1}| > |u^n|$ (there are also other definitions of stability), or if

$$|1 - \delta t \lambda| > 1 \quad , \quad (8)$$

which is the case for $\delta t > 2/\lambda$ (and also for $\delta t < 0$). In this case, the solution oscillates between positive and negative values with an exponentially growing amplitude.

III. GAMMA DRIVER

The BSSN [2] Gamma Driver condition is a time evolution equation for the shift vector β^i , given by (see e.g. (43) in [3])

$$\partial_t^2 \beta^i = F \partial_t \tilde{\Gamma}^i - \eta \partial_t \beta^i \quad . \quad (9)$$

There exist variations of the Gamma Driver condition, but the fundamental form of the equation remains the same. The term $F \partial_t \tilde{\Gamma}^i$ contains second spatial derivatives of the shift β^i and renders this a hyperbolic, wave-type equation for the shift. The parameter $\eta > 0$ is a damping parameter, very similar to λ in (3) above. It drives $\partial_t \beta^i$ to zero, so that the shift β^i will tend to

*Electronic address: schnetter@cct.lsu.edu;
URL: <http://www.cct.lsu.edu/~eschnett/>

a constant in stationary spacetimes. (This makes this a *symmetry-seeking* gauge condition, since ∂_t will then tend to the corresponding Killing vector.)

Let us now consider a simple spacetime which is spatially homogeneous, i.e. where all spatial derivatives vanish. In this case (see e.g. (40) in [3]), $\partial_t \tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$, and only the damped oscillator equation

$$\partial_t^2 \beta^i = -\eta \partial_t \beta^i \quad (10)$$

remains. As we have seen above, solving this equation numerically still imposes a time step size limit, even though there is no length scale introduced by the spatial discretisation, so the spatial resolution can be chosen to be arbitrarily large; there is therefore no CFL limit. This demonstrates that the damping time scale set by the parameter η introduces a resolution-independent time step size limit.

This instability was e.g. reported in [4], below (13) there, without explaining its cause. The authors state that the choice $\eta = 2$ is unstable near the outer boundary, and they therefore choose $\eta = 1$ instead. Decreasing η by a factor of 2 increases the time step size limit correspondingly.

The explanation presented above was first brought forth by Carsten Gundlach [5] and Ian Hawke [6]. To our knowledge, it has not yet been discussed in the literature elsewhere.

Harmonic formulations of the Einstein equations have driver parameters similar to the BSSN Gamma Driver parameter η . Spatially varying parameters were introduced in harmonic formulations to simplify the gauge dynamics in the wave extraction zone far away from the origin (see e.g. (8) in [7]). [8] uses a harmonic formulation with mesh refinement, and describes using this spatial dependence also to avoid time stepping instabilities (see (45) there).

IV. MESH REFINEMENT

When using mesh refinement to study compact objects, such as black holes, neutron stars, or binary systems of these, one generally uses a grid structure that has a fine resolution near the centre and successively coarser resolutions further away from the centre. With full Berger-Oliger AMR that uses sub-cycling in time, the CFL factors on all refinement levels are the same, and thus the time step sizes increase as one moves away from the centre. This makes it possible that the time step size on the coarsest grids does not satisfy the stability condition for the Gamma Driver damping parameter η any more.

One solution to this problem is to omit sub-cycling in time for the coarsest grids by choosing the same time step size for some of the coarsest grids. This was first advocated by [9], although it was introduced there to allow large shift vectors near the outer boundary as necessary for a co-rotating coordinate system. It was later used in [10] (see section IV there) to avoid an instability near the outer boundary, although the instability is

there not attributed to the Gamma Driver. Omitting sub-cycling in time on the coarsest grids often increases the computational cost only marginally, since most of the computation time is spent on the finest levels.

Another solution is to choose a spatially varying parameter η , e.g. based on the coordinate radius and mimicking the temporal resolution of the grid structure, which may grow linearly with the radius. This follows the interpretation of η setting the damping timescale, which must not be larger than the timescale set by the time discretisation.

One possible spatially varying definition for η could be

$$\eta(r) := \eta^* \frac{R^2}{r^2 + R^2} \quad , \quad (11)$$

where r is the coordinate distance from the centre of the black hole. The parameter R defines a transition radius between an inner region, where η is approximately equal to η^* , and an outer region, where η gradually decreases to zero. This definition is simple, smooth, and differentiable, and mimics a “typical” mesh refinement setup, where the resolution h grows approximately linearly with the radius r .

Another, simpler definition for η (which is not smooth – but smoothness is not necessary; η could even be discontinuous) is

$$\eta(r) := \eta^* \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } r \leq R \text{ (near the origin)} \\ \frac{R}{r} & \text{for } r \geq R \text{ (far away)} \end{cases} \quad , \quad (12)$$

which is e.g. implemented in the `McLachlan` code [11].

If there are multiple black holes, possibly with differing resolution requirements, then prescriptions such as (11) or (12) need to be suitably generalised, e.g. via

$$\frac{1}{\eta(r)} := \frac{1}{\eta_1(r_1)} + \frac{1}{\eta_2(r_2)} \quad , \quad (13)$$

where η_1 and η_2 are the contributions from the individual black holes, with r_1 and r_2 the distances to their centres. This form of (13) is motivated by the dimension of η , which is $1/M$, so that two superposed black holes of masses m_1 and m_2 lead to the same definition of η as a single black hole with mass $m_1 + m_2$.

Another prescription for a spatially varying η has been suggested in [12]. In this prescription, η depends on the determinant of the three-metric, and it thus takes the masses of the black hole(s) automatically into account. This prescription is motivated by binary systems of black holes with unequal masses, where η near the individual black holes should be adapted to the individual black holes’ masses, and it may be more suitable to use this instead of (13).

There can be other limitations of the time step size near the outer boundary, coming e.g. from the boundary condition itself. In particular, radiative boundary conditions impose a CFL limit that may be stricter than the CFL condition from the time evolution equations in the interior.

Acknowledgments

We thank Peter Diener, Christian D. Ott, and Ulrich Sperhake for valuable input, and for suggesting and implementing the spatially varying beta driver in (12). We

also thank Bernd Brügmann for his comments. This work was supported by the NSF awards #0721915 and #0905046. It used computational resources provided by LSU, LONI, and the NSF TeraGrid allocation TG-MCA02N014.

-
- [1] Wikipedia: Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy condition, 2009. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy_condition
 - [2] Miguel Alcubierre, Bernd Brügmann, Thomas Dramlitsch, José A. Font, Philippos Papadopoulos, Edward Seidel, Nikolaos Stergioulas, and Ryoji Takahashi. Towards a stable numerical evolution of strongly gravitating systems in general relativity: The conformal treatments. *Phys. Rev. D*, 62:044034, 2000.
 - [3] Miguel Alcubierre, Bernd Brügmann, Peter Diener, Michael Koppitz, Denis Pollney, Edward Seidel, and Ryoji Takahashi. Gauge conditions for long-term numerical black hole evolutions without excision. *Phys. Rev. D*, 67:084023, 2003.
 - [4] Ulrich Sperhake. Binary black-hole evolutions of excision and puncture data. *Phys. Rev. D*, 76:104015, 2007.
 - [5] Carsten Gundlach. private communication, 2008.
 - [6] Ian Hawke. Talk: Extreme collapse and multifluids (whisky retreat, parma, 2008), 2008.
 - [7] Mark A. Scheel et al. High-accuracy waveforms for binary black hole inspiral, merger, and ringdown. *Phys. Rev.*, D79:024003, 2009.
 - [8] Carlos Palenzuela, Luis Lehner, and Shin Yoshida. Understanding possible electromagnetic counterparts to loud gravitational wave events: Binary black hole effects on electromagnetic fields. *Phys. Rev.*, D81:084007, 2010.
 - [9] Bernd Brügmann, Wolfgang Tichy, and Nina Jansen. Numerical simulation of orbiting black holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:211101, 2004.
 - [10] Bernd Brügmann, José A. González, Mark Hannam, Sascha Husa, and Ulrich Sperhake. Calibration of Moving Puncture Simulations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 77:024027, 2008.
 - [11] McLachlan, a Public BSSN Code, <http://www.cct.lsu.edu/~eschnett/McLachlan/>.
 - [12] Doreen Müller and Bernd Brügmann. Toward a dynamical shift condition for unequal mass black hole binary simulations. 2009.